UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,188	02/07/2007	Yukiko Ohira	159-100	7241
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 09/24/201 NDERHYE. PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	FORTUNA, JOSE A		
ARLINGTON,	VA 22203		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1791		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/24/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/576,188	OHIRA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Jose A. Fortuna	1791	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>16 September 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affida al (with appeal fee) in compliand	vit, or other evidence, v e with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ao no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mail	ing date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amour nortened statutory period for reply or	nt of the fee. The appropri iginally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must b	e filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	to avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brie	f, will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	·	OTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	• •		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially i	educing or simplifying t	he issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally r	signification of the control of the	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally to	sjected ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1 See attached Notice of Non-C	Compliant Amendment (	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		ompliant / anonamont (	1 102 02+).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	onazio ii osaziiiioa iii a oopai att	, amony mod amondmon	n can coming the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a	Notice of Appeal will no	t be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under app	eal and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>			ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/José A Fortuna/		
	Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1791		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are not convincing for the same reasons as explained in the final rejection mailed on July 16, 2010. Applicants' have not clearly pointed out how the combination of references, (note that the secondary references have been used for particular teachings and not as a whole). The rejection explains the advanages of using the particular teachings f the secondary references on the primary references. However, applicants have argued the individual references and not the combination. "The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference.... Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of those references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). See also In re Sneed, 710 F.2d 1544, 1550, 218 USPQ 385, 389 (Fed. Cir. 1983) ("[I]t is not necessary that the inventions of the references be physically combinable to render obvious the invention under review."); and In re Nievelt, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973) ("Combining the teachings of references does not involve an ability to combine their specific structures.").

As to claims 5 and 6, applicants' argue that the references do not teach the gloss at the claimed points, which it is true. However the examiner's contention is that the combination of the references would have the same or at least overlapping range of glossiness, since they are made using the same materials and procedures, note the combination of references, not the individual references. As to the arguments over the WO'03 reference, Nisogi et al., the examiner respectfully disagrees, because the only element which is not explicitly recited is the Cast Coating of the web. Yet they clearly teach that any well known method of coating could be used and cast coating is very well known technique and therefore, the claims are at the very least obvious over the cited reference. It is suggested to applicants to clearly point out why it would not have been obvious to combine the references or point out unexpected results.